All understanding of facts consists in generalizing concerning them. The fact that some things are ultimate may be recognized by the synechist without abandoning his standpoint, since synechism is a normative or regulative principle, not a theory of existence. The adjective “ synechological ” is used in the same general sense; “ synechology ” is a theory of continuity or universal causation; “ syncchia ” is a term in ophthalmology for a morbid union of parts.

**SYNEDRIUM** *(συνέδριο),* a Greek word which means “ assembly ” and is especially used of judicial or representative assemblies, is the name by which (or by its Hebrew transcription, םנחררי׀ *sanhedrin, sanhedrim)* that Jewish body is known which in its origin was the municipal council of Jerusalem, but acquired extended functions and no small authority and influence over the Jews at large (see xiii. 424 seq.). In the Mishnah it is called “ the sanhedrin,” “ the great sanhedrin,” “ the sanhedrin of seventy-one [members]” and “the great court of justice” *(bêth din haggadol).* The oldest testimony to the existence and constitution of the synedrium of Jerusalem is probably to be found in 2 Chron, xix. 8; for the priests, Levites and hereditary heads of houses there spoken of as sitting at Jerusalem as a court of appeal from the local judicatories does not correspond with anything mentioned in the old history, and it is the practice of the chronicler to refer the institutions of his own time to an origin in ancient Israel. And just such an aristocratic council is what seems to be meant by the gerousia or senate of “ elders ” repeatedly mentioned in the history of the Jews, both under the Greeks from the time of Antiochus the Great (Jos. *Ant.* xii. 3, 3) and under the Hasmonean high priests and princes. The high priest as the head of the state was doubtless also the head of the senate, which, according to Eastern υsage, exercised both judicial and administrative or political functions (cf. 1 Macc. xii. 6, xiv. 20). The exact measure of its authority must have varied from time to time at first with the measure of autonomy left to the nation by its foreign lords and afterwards with the more or less autocratic power claimed by the native sovereigns.

The original aristocratic constitution of the senate began to be modified under the later Hasmoneans by the inevitable intro­duction of representatives of the rising party of the Pharisees, and this new element gained strength under Herod the Great, the bitter enemy of the priestly aristocracy. Finally under the Roman procurators the synedrium was left under the presidency of the chief priest as the highest native tribunal, though without the power of life and death (John xviii. 31). The aristocratic and Sadducean element now again preponderated, as appears from Josephus and from the New Testament, in which “ chief priests ” and “ rulers ” are synonymous expressions. But with these there sat also “ scribes ” or trained legal doctors of the Pharisees and other notables, who are simply called “ elders ” (Mark xv. 1). The Jewish tradition which regards the synedrium as entirely composed of rabbins sitting under the presidency and vice-presidency of a pair of chief doctors, the *nasi* and a*b beth din,* is inconsistent with the evidence of Josephus and the New Testa­ment. It is generally held that it was after the fall of the state that a merely rabbinical *bêth din* sat at Jabneh and afterwards at Tiberias, and gave legal responses to those who chose to admit a judicature not recognized by the civil power. Dr A. Buehler has sought to reconcile the various accounts by the theory that there were two great tribunals in Jerusalem, one wielding religious, the other civil authority *(Das Synedrion in Jerusalem,* Vienna, 1902).

The council chamber *(βουλή)* where the synedrium usually sat was between the Xystus and the Temple, probably on the Temple­hill, the Mishnah states that the meetings were held within the inner court. The meeting in the palace of the high priest which condemned Jesus was exceptional. The proceedings also on this occasion were highly irregular, if measured by the rules of procedure which, according to Jewish tradition, were laid down to secure order and a fair trial for the accused.

Of the older literature of the subject it is enough to cite Selden, *De synedriis.* the most important critical discussion is that of Kuenen in the *Ver stager.,* &c., of the Amsterdam Academy (1866), p. 131 seq. A good summary is given by Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes,* 4th cd., § 23. Cf. also G.A. Smith, *Jerusalem* (1907), vol. i. ch. 9.

**SYNESIUS** *(c. 373-c.* 414), bishop of Ptolemais in the Libyan Pentapolis after 410, was born of wealthy parents, who claimed descent from Spartan kings, at Cyrene between 370 and 375. While still a youth (393) he went with his brother Euoptius to Alexandria, where he became an enthusiastic Neoplatonist and disciple of Hypatia *(q.v.).* On returning to his native place about the year 397 he was chosen to head an embassy from the cities of the Pentapolis to the imperial court to ask for remission of taxation and other relief. His address to Arcadius *(De regno)* is full of advice as to the studies of a wise ruler in such perilous times. His three years’ stay in Constantinople was wearisome and otherwise disagreeable; the leisure it forced upon him he devoted in part to literary composition. The *Aegyptus sive de providentiel* is an allegory in which the good Osiris and the evil Typhon, who represent Aurelian and the Goth Gainas (ministers under Arcadius), strive for mastery; and the question of the divine permission of evil is handled. After the successful Aure­lian had granted the petition of the embassy, Synesius returned to Cyrene in 400, and spent the next ten years partly in that city, when unavoidable business called him there, but chiefly on an estate in the interior of the province, where in his own words “ books and the chase ” made up his life. His marriage took place at Alexandria in 403; in the previous year he had visited Athens. In 40q or 410 Synesius, whose Christianity had until then been by no means very pronounced, was popularly chosen to be bishop of Ptolemais, and, after long hesitation on personal and doctrinal grounds, he ultimately accepted the office thus thrust upon him, being consecrated by Theophilus at Alexandria. One personal difficulty at least was obviated by his being allowed to retain his wife, to whom he was much attached; but as regarded orthodoxy he expressly stipulated for personal freedom to dissent on the questions of the soul’s creation, a literal resurrection, and the final destruction of the world, while at the same time he agreed to make some concession to popular views in his public teaching (*τα* *µεv οίκοι φιλοσόφων, τα δ*’ ε*ξω φιλoμυθωv).* His tenure of the bishopric was troubled not only by domestic bereave­ments but also by barbaric invasions of the country (in repelling which he proved himself a capable military organizer) and by conflicts with the prefect Andronicus, whom he excommunicated for interfering with the Church’s right of asylum. The date of his death is unknown; it is usually given as *c.* 414. His many-sided activity, as shown especially in his letters, and his loosely mediating position between Neoplatonism and Christianity, make him a subject of fascinating interest. His scientific interests are attested by his letter to Hypatia in which occurs the earliest known reference to areometry, and by a work on alchemy in the form of a commentary on pseudo-Democritus. He was a man of the highest personal character.

His extant works are—(1) a speech before Arcadius, *De regno;* (2) *Dio, sive de suo ipsius institute,* in which he signifies his purpose to devote himself to true philosophy ; (3) *Encomium calvitii* (he was himself bald), a literary jew *d'espτit,* suggested by Dio Chrysostom’s *Praise of Hair;* (4) *De providentia,* in two books; (5) *De insomniis;* (6) 157 *Epistolae;* (7) 12 *Hymni,* of a contemplative, Neoplatonic character; and several homilies and occasional speeches. The *editio princeps* is that of Tumebus (Paris, 1553); it was followed by that of Morell, with Latin translation by Petavius (1612 ; greatly enlarged and improved, 1633 ; reprinted, inaccurately, by Migne, 1859). The *Epistolae,* which for the modern reader greatly exceed his other works in interest, have been edited by Demetriades (Vienna, 1792) and by Glukus (Venice, 1812), the *Calvitii encomium* by Krabinger (Stuttgart, 1834), the *De providentia* by Krabinger (Sulzbach, 1835), the *De regno* by Krabinger (Munich, 1825), and the *Hymns* by Flach (Tübingen, 1875).

See Clausen, *De Synesio philosophe* (Copenhagen, 1831); R. Volkmann, *Synesius von Cyrene* (Berlin, i860); A. Gardner's mono­graph in “ The Fathers for English Readers ” (London, 1886) ; and a life by W. S. Crawford (London, 1901).

**SYNOD (Gr.** *σύνοδος),* a term denoting an assembly of ecclesi­astical officials legally convoked to discuss and decide points of faith, discipline and morals. It is practically synonymous with the word council *(q.v.); concilium* is used in the same technical sense by Tertullian *c.* 200, and *σvvoδos* a century or so later in the Apostolic canons. In time, however, the word council came to .be restricted to oecumenical gatherings, while synod was applied to meetings of the eastern or western branches of the Church